

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/706,149	11/12/2003	Lakshman S. Withanawasam	Honeywell No. H0004595	6076	
75	90 09/15/2005		EXAMINER		
Matthew Luxton			AURORA, REENA		
Honeywell International, Inc.					
101 Columbia Road			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
P.O. Box 2245		2862			
Morristown, N.	J 07962-2245				

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			<u></u>	<u></u>		
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
•		10/706,149	WITHANAWASAM ET	AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Reena Aurora	2862			
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication or Reply	appears on the cover sh	eet with the correspondence addres	;s		
THE - External after of the control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REMAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CF of SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication of period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, so period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory per ure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by some reply received by the Office later than three months after the month of the provided patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DN. R 1.136(a). In no event, however, n. a reply within the statutory minimur ririod will apply and will expire SIX ( tatute, cause the application to bec	may a reply be timely filed  n of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. 6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commu ome ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	inication.		
Status						
1)🛛	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1	11 July 200 <u>5</u> .				
2a)□	•	This action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	tion of Claims					
5)	Claim(s) 1 - 18 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) 12 - 15 is/are with Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1 - 11 and 16 - 18 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	hdrawn from consideratio				
Applicat	ion Papers					
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Example drawing(s) filed on <u>12 November 2003</u> Applicant may not request that any objection to Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the co	is/are: a)⊠ accepted o the drawing(s) be held in a rrection is required if the dr	beyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). awing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1	.121(d).		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for form All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority docum  2. Certified copies of the priority docum  3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International Buse the attached detailed Office action for a	nents have been received nents have been received priority documents have treau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))	d. d in Application No been received in this National Stag	ge		
Attachmei 1) ⊠ Noti	nt(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	4)	rview Summary (PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Noti 3) 🔯 Info	ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/Ster No(s)/Mail Date 11/12/03.07/01/05.	) Pap	er No(s)/Mail Date ce of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152	2)		

Application/Control Number: 10/706,149

Art Unit: 2862

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election with traverse of invention I (claims 1 – 11 and 16 - 18) in the reply filed on 07/01/05 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that detailed description and figures calls for the semiconductor subsurface to have an angular sensor and a linear sensor, meaning the angular and linear sensors are formed on same substrate, rather than being separate devices simply mounted on the substrate. In this configuration, the angular and linear sensors are subject to similar manufacturing conditions. This is not found persuasive because in the instant case the sensor as claimed can be made by a materially different process such as instead of forming on a common substrate this particular sensor can be mounted on the substrate, therefore the sensor does not require the particular steps of making of the sensor as claimed by the applicant.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

## Specification

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: On page, applicant should update that the application No. 10/002,454 is now US Patent No. 6,707,293.

Appropriate correction is required.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,149

Art Unit: 2862

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1 – 9, 11 and 16 - 18 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,293 (Wan et al.) in view of 6,212,783 (Ott et al.).

As to claims 1 and 16 - 18, Wan et al. (hereinafter Wan) discloses all the elements of claim 1 except a semiconductor substrate having both sensors. Ott et al. (hereinafter Ott) discloses an arrangement for contactless determination of an angular position of a rotatable element including two sensor elements (IC1 and IC2) located on a substrate (16, fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Wan with the teachings of Ott such that providing both sensors on a semiconductor surface in order to reduce the size of the device.

Claims 2 and 4 of the application corresponds to claim 2 of US 6,707,293.

Claim 3 of the application corresponds to claims 4 and 10 of US 6,707,293.

Application/Control Number: 10/706,149

Art Unit: 2862

Claim 5, Wan discloses that the linear sensor is coaxially located with respect to the angular sensor (claim 12). Wan fails to show that both the sensors are located on the semiconductor substrate. Ott discloses an arrangement for contactless determination of an angular position of a rotatable element including two sensor elements (IC1 and IC2) located on a substrate (16, fig. 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Wan with the teachings of Ott such that providing both sensors on a semiconductor surface in order to reduce the size of the device.

Claim 6, of the application corresponds to claims 13 - 15 of US 6,707,293.

Claim 7 of the application corresponds to claims 5 and 6 of US 6,707,293.

Claim 8 of the application corresponds to claim 7 of US 6,707,293.

Claim 9 of the application corresponds to claim 12 of US 6,707,293.

Claim 11, of the application corresponds to claims 1, 2, 12, 13 and 27 of US 6,707,293.

Claims 10, is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,707,293 (Wan et al.) in view of Applicant admitted prior art (AAPA).

Claim 10, Wan fails to show that the linear sensor and the angular sensor are magnetoresistive sensors. AAPA discloses that it is well known to use magnetoresistive sensors as linear sensor (page 2, line 16) and angular sensors (page 3, line 4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the device of Wan with the teachings of AAPA

Art Unit: 2862

such that providing magnetoresistive sensors as linear and angular sensor would provide similar results.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Reena Aurora whose telephone number is 571-272-2263. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 7:00 - 3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, E. Lefkowitz can be reached on 571-272-2180. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Reena Aurora Examiner